arXiv:1610.09802v1 [stat.ME] 31 Oct 2016

Confidence intervals centered on bootstrap smoothed estimators

Paul Kabaila*, **Christeen Wijethunga**

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, La Trobe University, Victoria 3086, Australia.

ABSTRACT

Applied statisticians commonly carry out preliminary data-based model selection and then construct a confidence interval assuming that the selected model had been given a priori, as the true model. The resulting post-model-selection confidence interval has endpoints that are discontinuous functions of the data and typically has very poor coverage properties. As an improvement, Efron 2014 proposed a confidence interval centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimated standard deviation. We evaluate this confidence interval in the scenario of two nested linear regression models, the full model and a simpler model, and a preliminary test of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. We derive computationally convenient expressions for the ideal bootstrap smoothed estimator and its standard deviation and the coverage probability and expected length of this confidence interval. In terms of coverage probability, this confidence interval outperforms the post-model-selection confidence interval with the same nominal coverage and based on the same preliminary test. However, the confidence interval centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator does not perform substantially better, in terms of expected length, than the usual confidence interval, with the same minimum coverage probablility, based on the full model. This suggests that finding a good data-based width for a confidence interval centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator is still an open problem.

Keywords: Bagging; Bootstrap smoothing; Coverage probability; Preliminary model selection.

* Corresponding author. Tel: +61-03-9479-2594; fax: +61-03-9479-2466. E-mail address: P.Kabaila@latrobe.edu.au

1. Introduction

In applied statistics it is common practice to carry out preliminary data-based model selection (using e.g. hypothesis tests or minimizing a criterion such as AIC) and then to use the selected model to construct a confidence interval (CI) for the parameter of interest on the assumption that the selected model had been given to us *a priori*, as the true model. This post-model-selection CI has the inherently undesirable property that its endpoints are discontinuous functions of the data. Furthermore, this CI may have minimum coverage probability far below nominal (see e.g. Leeb and Pötscher, 2005 and Kabaila, 2009). Consequently, statistical practitioners desperately need a method of constructing CI's that deals properly with the "model uncertainty" commonly encountered in applications.

In response to this need a number of frequentist model averaged CI's have been proposed (Buckland *et al.*, 1997, Hjort and Claeskens, 2003, Fletcher and Turek, 2011, Turek and Fletcher, 2012). A related approach is the proposal of Efron (2014) of a CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed (or bagged, Breiman, 1996) estimator, which is a smoothed version of the post-model-selection estimator. This CI, with nominal coverage $1-\alpha$, has half-width equal to the $1-\alpha/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution multiplied by the estimate of the standard deviation of this estimator. Efron calls this the "standard" CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator. The estimate of the standard deviation of this estimator is found by estimating either (a) the actual standard deviation, $\texttt{sd}$, of this estimator or (b) the delta-method approximation, $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$, to this standard deviation.

To evaluate this proposal, we consider the simple, though informative, scenario of two nested normal linear regression models with known error variance and parameter of interest θ a specified linear combination of the regression parameters. These two nested models are the full model and the simpler model where τ, a distinct specified linear combination of the regression parameters, is set to 0. The preliminary model selection consists of a test of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This scenario was used by Kabaila, Welsh and Abeysekera (2016) and Kabaila, Welsh and Mainzer (2016) to evaluate the frequentist model averaged confidence intervals proposed by Fletcher and Turek (2011) and Turek and Fletcher (2012).

In Section 3, we derive computationally convenient exact expressions for the ideal (i.e. the limit as the number of bootstrap simulations approaches infinity) bootstrap estimator and its actual standard deviation $\texttt{sd}$. The delta-method approximation $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$ to this standard deviation has already been derived by Efron (2014). For the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimate of either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$, we derive computationally convenient exact expressions for the coverage probability and the scaled expected length of this CI, where the scaling is with respect to the expected length of the usual CI, with the same minimum coverage probability, based on the full model.

Let $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\tau}$ denote the least squares estimators of θ and τ, respectively. In Section 4, we consider the coverage probability of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is obtained from the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with given size, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has given nominal coverage and width proportional to the estimate of either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. We show that this coverage probability is determined by the known correlation $\rho = \text{corr}(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\tau})$ and the unknown parameter $\gamma = \tau/(\text{standard deviation of } \widehat{\tau})$. We also show that this coverage probability is an even function of γ, for every given ρ, and an even function of ρ, for every given γ. We are therefore able to encapsulate the coverage probability function of this CI, for all possible choices of design matrix, parameter of interest θ and parameter τ that specifies the simpler model, using only the two parameters $|\rho|$ and $|\gamma|$.

The top panel of Figure 1 includes the graph (solid line) of the coverage probability of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is based on the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95 and width proportional to the estimate of $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. We consider $|\rho| = 0.7$. Also included in this panel is the graph (dashed line) of the coverage probability of the post-model-selection CI with the same nominal coverage and based on the same preliminary test. This panel provides an illustration of the fact, established through an extensive numerical investigation which is not presented here, that the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with

width proportional to either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$, outperforms the post-model-selection CI, with the same nominal coverage and based on the same preliminary test, in terms of minimum coverage probability.

Even more revealing than the coverage probability function of this CI is its scaled expected length, where the scaling is with respect to the expected length of the usual CI, with the same minimum coverage probability, based on the full model. In Section 5, we consider the scaled expected length of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is obtained from the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with given size, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has given nominal coverage and width proportional to the estimate of either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. We show that this scaled expected length is determined by the known correlation ρ and the unknown parameter γ. We also show that this scaled expected length is an even function of γ, for every given ρ, and an even function of ρ, for every given γ. We are therefore able to encapsulate the scaled expected length of this CI, for all possible choices of design matrix, parameter of interest θ and parameter τ that specifies the simpler model, using only the two parameters $|\rho|$ and $|\gamma|$.

The bootstrap smoothed estimator is obtained by smoothing the post-model-selection estimator that results from a preliminary test of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct i.e. that $\gamma = 0$. This post-model-selection estimator is usually motivated by a desire for good performance when the simpler model is correct. Therefore, ideally, the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimate of either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$, should have a scaled expected length that is substantially less than 1 when $\gamma = 0$. In addition, ideally, this confidence interval should have scaled expected length that (a) has maximum value that is not too much larger than 1 and (b) approaches 1 as $|\gamma|$ approaches infinity.

The bottom panel of Figure 1 is the graph of the scaled expected length of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is based on the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95

and width proportional to the estimate of $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. Here $|\rho| = 0.7$. This panel provides an illustration of the following two properties of CI's centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimate of either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. The scaled expected lengths of these CI's (a) are never more than slightly less than 1 at $\gamma = 0$ and (b) have maximum values that are increasing functions of $|\rho|$ that can be much larger than 1 for $|\rho|$ large. These properties are established, through extensive numerical evaluation, in the Supplementary material. Our overall interpretation of these two properties is that the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimated standard deviation, does not perform substantially better than the the usual confidence interval, with the same minimum coverage probability, based on the full model. All of computations for this paper were performed using programs, written in the `R` language, which are available from the corresponding author upon request.

The choice of data-based width of a CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator has a crucial role in determining the performance, in terms of coverage and scaled expected length, of this CI. Our conclusion is that finding a good data-based width is still an open problem.

2. The two models and the post-model-selection estimator

We consider two nested linear regression models: the full model $\mathcal{M}_2$ and the submodel $\mathcal{M}_1$. Suppose that the full model $\mathcal{M}_2$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{y}$ is a random n-vector of responses, $\boldsymbol{X}$ is a known $n \times p$ matrix with linearly independent columns ($p < n$), $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is an unknown p-vector of parameters and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_n)$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\theta, \tau, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top]^\top$, where θ is the scalar parameter of interest, τ is a scalar parameter used in specifying the model $\mathcal{M}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ is a $(p-2)$-dimensional parameter vector. The model $\mathcal{M}_1$ is $\mathcal{M}_2$ with $\tau = 0$. As shown in the Supplementary material, this scenario can be obtained by a change of parametrization from a more general scenario.



Figure 1: The top panel includes a graph (dashed line) of the coverage probability of the post-model-selection CI, based on a preliminary hypothesis test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95. The top and bottom panels include graphs (solid lines) of the coverage probability and scaled expected length, respectively, for the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$ and based on the post-model-selection estimator obtained after the same preliminary test. This CI also have nominal coverage 0.95. Here $|\rho| = 0.7$.

Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ denote the least squares estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, so that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\boldsymbol{X}^\top \boldsymbol{X})^{-1} \boldsymbol{X}^\top \boldsymbol{y}$. Also let $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\tau}$ denote the first and second components of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, respectively. Let $v_\theta = \mathrm{var}(\widehat{\theta})$, $v_\tau = \mathrm{var}(\widehat{\tau})$ and $\rho = \mathrm{corr}(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\tau})$. Note that v_θ, v_τ and ρ are known. Let $\gamma = \tau / v_\tau^{1/2}$, which is an unknown parameter, and also let $\widehat{\gamma} = \widehat{\tau} / v_\tau^{1/2}$. We will express all quantities of interest in terms of the random vector $\big(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\gamma}\big)$, which has a bivariate normal distribution with mean (θ, γ) and known covariance matrix.

Suppose that we carry out a preliminary test of the null hypothesis $\tau = 0$ against the alternative hypothesis $\tau \neq 0$. The test statistic is $|\widehat{\gamma}|$, which has the same distribution as $|Z|$, for $Z \sim N(0, 1)$, under the null hypothesis. For given value of the positive number d, suppose that we accept this null hypothesis when $|\widehat{\gamma}| \leq d$; otherwise we reject this null hypothesis. In other words, if $|\widehat{\gamma}| \leq d$ we choose model $\mathcal{M}_1$; otherwise we choose model $\mathcal{M}_2$. Now the least squares estimators of θ under the models $\mathcal{M}_2$ and $\mathcal{M}_1$ are $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\theta} - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2}\, \widehat{\gamma}$, respectively. Therefore our post-model-selection ("two-stage") estimator of θ is

$$\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}} = \begin{cases} \widehat{\theta} - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2}\, \widehat{\gamma} & \text{if } |\widehat{\gamma}| \leq d \\ \widehat{\theta} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

For $\rho \neq 0$, we note that $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}$ is (in the terminology of Efron, 2014) a "jumpy" estimate: as $|\widehat{\gamma}|$ increases through the value d, $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}$ will change discontinuously. The post-model-selection CI, centered on $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}$, is described in the appendix, where we also present a computationally convenient formula for the coverage probability of this CI. Henceforth, we suppose that the known quantities ρ and v_θ and the cutoff d (or, equivalently, the size α_1 of the preliminary test with this cutoff) are given.

3. Computationally convenient exact formulae for the ideal bootstrap smoothed estimate, standard deviation and delta-method approximation to the standard deviation

Efron (2014) describes the ideal bootstrap smoothed estimate $\widetilde{\theta}$ of θ by considering a limit as the number of boostrap resamples $B \to \infty$. Because we are dealing with a parametric bootstrap, we are able to express the ideal bootstrap smoothed estimate as follows. Let $E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}})$ denote the expected value of $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}$, for true parameter value $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. The ideal bootstrap smoothed estimate $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}$ is obtained by first evaluating $E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}})$ and then replacing $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

The following theorem, proved in the appendix, provides a computationally convenient exact formula for $E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}})$. Let Φ and ϕ denote the $N(0,1)$ cumulative distribution function and probability density function, respectively.

Theorem 1. *Let* $k(\gamma) = \phi(d+\gamma) - \phi(d-\gamma) + \gamma\big[\Phi(d-\gamma) - \Phi(-d-\gamma)\big]$. *Then*

$$E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}) = \theta - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2}\, k(\gamma).$$

Note that $k(0) = 0$ *and* $k(\gamma)$ *is an odd function of* γ *that takes positive values for all* $\gamma > 0$ *and approaches 0 as* $\gamma \to \infty$.

It follows from this theorem that the ideal bootstrap smoothed estimator $\widetilde{\theta}$ satisfies

$$\widetilde{\theta} = \widehat{\theta} - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2}\, k(\widehat{\gamma}). \tag{3}$$

The following theorem, proved in the appendix, provides a computationally convenient exact formula for the standard deviation of $\widetilde{\theta}$. We denote this standard deviation by $\mathtt{sd}(\gamma)$.

Theorem 2. *The standard deviation of* $\widetilde{\theta}$ *is a function of* γ, *which we denote by* $\mathtt{sd}(\gamma)$, *is* $v_\theta^{1/2}\, r(\gamma;\rho)$, *where*

$$r(\gamma;\rho) = \left(1 - 2\rho^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k(z)\,(z-\gamma)\,\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz + \rho^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \big(k(z) - m_k(\gamma)\big)^2\,\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz\right)^{1/2},$$

for

$$m_k(\gamma) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k(z)\,\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz.$$

The following theorem, proved in the appendix, provides a computationally convenient exact formula for the delta-method approximation to the standard deviation of the ideal bootstrap smoothed estimator $\widetilde{\theta}$.

Theorem 3. *Let* $q(\gamma) = \Phi(d-\gamma) - \Phi(-d-\gamma) - d\,\big[\phi(d+\gamma) + \phi(d-\gamma)\big]$. *Note that* $q(\gamma)$ *is an even function of* γ. *The delta-method approximation to the standard deviation of* $\widetilde{\theta}$ *is a function of* γ, *which we denote by* $\mathtt{sd}_{\text{delta}}(\gamma)$, *and is* $v_\theta^{1/2}\, r_{\text{delta}}(\gamma;\rho)$, *where*

$$r_{\text{delta}}(\gamma;\rho) = \big(1 - 2\rho^2 q(\gamma) + \rho^2 q^2(\gamma)\big)^{1/2}.$$

We consider the following CI's for θ centered on the bootstrap smoothed esimator $\widetilde{\theta}$, with nominal coverage $1-\alpha$:

$$J = \left[\widetilde{\theta} - z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathtt{sd}(\widehat{\gamma}),\, \widetilde{\theta} + z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathtt{sd}(\widehat{\gamma})\right]$$
$$J_{\text{delta}} = \left[\widetilde{\theta} - z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathtt{sd}_{\text{delta}}(\widehat{\gamma}),\, \widetilde{\theta} + z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathtt{sd}_{\text{delta}}(\widehat{\gamma})\right],$$

where the quantile z_a is defined by $P(Z \le z_a) = a$ for $Z \sim N(0,1)$.

Now let $I(c)$ denote the usual CI for θ, with coverage c, based on the full model. In other words, let $I(c) = \left[\widehat{\theta} - z_{(1+c)/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2}, \widehat{\theta} + z_{(1+c)/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2}\right]$. When $|\rho| = 0$, both J and J_{delta} are identical to $I(1-\alpha)$. However, as $|\rho|$ increases both of the confidence intervals J and J_{delta} increasingly differ from $I(1-\alpha)$.

4. Coverage probability of the confidence interval centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator

Let $CP(\gamma,\rho)$ and $CP_{\text{delta}}(\gamma,\rho)$ denote the coverage probabilities $P(\theta \in J)$ and $P(\theta \in J_{\text{delta}})$, respectively. Also let $\Phi(\ell, u; \mu, v) = P(\ell \le Z \le u)$ for $Z \sim N(\mu, v)$. The following theorem is proved in the appendix.

Theorem 4. *Let*

$$\ell(\gamma,\rho) = -z_{1-\alpha/2}\, r(\gamma;\rho) + \rho\, k(\gamma)$$
$$u(\gamma,\rho) = z_{1-\alpha/2}\, r(\gamma;\rho) + \rho\, k(\gamma).$$

Then

(a)

$$CP(\gamma,\rho) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\big(\ell(h,\rho), u(h,\rho); \rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\big)\, \phi(h-\gamma)\, dh, \tag{4}$$

(b) For every given ρ, $CP(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of γ and, for every given γ, $CP(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of ρ.

The proof of the following theorem is the same as the proof of Theorem 4, but with $r(\gamma;\rho)$ replaced by $r_{\text{delta}}(\gamma;\rho)$.

Theorem 5. *Let*

$$\ell_{\text{delta}}(\gamma,\rho) = -z_{1-\alpha/2}\, r_{\text{delta}}(\gamma;\rho) + \rho\, k(\gamma)$$
$$u_{\text{delta}}(\gamma,\rho) = z_{1-\alpha/2}\, r_{\text{delta}}(\gamma;\rho) + \rho\, k(\gamma).$$

Then

(a)

$$CP_{\text{delta}}(\gamma,\rho)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\Phi\big(\ell_{\,\text{delta}}(h,\rho),u_{\,\text{delta}}(h,\rho);\rho(h-\gamma),1-\rho^2\big)\,\phi(h-\gamma)\,dh.$$

(b) For every given ρ, $CP_{\text{delta}}(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of γ and, for every given γ, $CP_{\text{delta}}(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of ρ.

Figure 2 is the graph of the coverage probability of the confidence interval J_{delta} centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is based on the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95 and width proportional to the estimate of $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. We consider $|\rho|=0.2,0.5,0.7$ and 0.9. This panel provides an illustration of the following property of the confidence intervals J and J_{delta}. The minimum coverage probabilities of these confidence intervals are decreasing continuous functions of $|\rho|$ that equal the nominal coverage of this CI for $|\rho|=0$. This property is established, through extensive numerical evaluation, in the Supplementary material.

5. Scaled expected length of the confidence interval centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator

The scaled expected length of the confidence interval J, with nominal coverage $1-\alpha$, is defined as follows. Let $c_{\min}$ denote the minimum coverage probability of this confidence interval. The scaled expected length of J, denoted $SEL(\gamma,\rho)$, is defined to be the ratio $E(\text{length of } J)/E(\text{length of } I(c_{\min}))$. The following theorem is proved in the appendix.

Theorem 6. *Let $c_{\min}$ denote the minimum coverage probability of the confidence interval J, with nominal coverage $1-\alpha$. Then*

(a)

$$SEL(\gamma,\rho)=\frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}r(h;\rho)\,\phi(h-\gamma)\,dh.$$

(b) For every given ρ, $SEL(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of γ and, for every given γ, $SEL(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of ρ.



Figure 2: Graphs, for $|\rho| = 0.2, 0.5, 0.7$ and 0.9, of the coverage probability of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is based on the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95 and width proportional to $\mathtt{sd}_{\mathrm{delta}}$.

The scaled expected length of the confidence interval J_{delta}, denoted by $SEL_{\mathrm{delta}}(\gamma, \rho)$, is defined in a similar way to the scaled expected length of J. The proof of the following theorem is the same as the proof of Theorem 6, but with $r(\gamma; \rho)$ replaced by $r_{\,\mathrm{delta}}(\gamma; \rho)$.

Theorem 7. *Let $c_{\min}$ denote the minimum coverage probability of the confidence interval J_{delta}, with nominal coverage $1 - \alpha$. Then*

(a)

$$SEL_{\mathrm{delta}}(\gamma, \rho) = \frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} r_{\mathrm{delta}}(h; \rho)\, \phi(h - \gamma)\, dh.$$

(b) For every given ρ, $SEL_{\mathrm{delta}}(\gamma, \rho)$ is an even function of γ and, for every given γ, $SEL_{\mathrm{delta}}(\gamma, \rho)$ is an even function of ρ.

Figure 3 is the graph of the scaled expected length of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is based on the post-model-selection estimator

obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95 and width proportional to the estimate of $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. We consider $|\rho| = 0.2, 0.5, 0.7$ and 0.9. This figure provides an illustration of the following two properties of CI's centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimate of either $\texttt{sd}$ or $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$. The scaled expected lengths of these CI's (a) are never more than slightly less than 1 at $\gamma = 0$ and (b) have maximum values that are increasing functions of $|\rho|$ that can be much larger than 1 for $|\rho|$ large. These properties are established, through extensive numerical evaluation, in the Supplementary material. Our overall interpretation of these two properties is that the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, with width proportional to the estimated standard deviation, does not perform substantially better than the the usual confidence interval, with the same minimum coverage probability, based on the full model.



Figure 3: Graphs, for $|\rho| = 0.2, 0.5, 0.7$ and 0.9, of the scaled expected length of the CI centered on the bootstrap smoothed estimator, which is based on the post-model-selection estimator obtained after a preliminary hypothesis test, with size 0.1, of the null hypothesis that the simpler model is correct. This CI has nominal coverage 0.95 and width proportional to the estimate of $\texttt{sd}_{\text{delta}}$.

Appendix: Change of parametrization of a more general scenario and proofs of Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6

In this appendix, we describe the post-model-selection CI and a computationally convenient formula for its coverage probability. Then we show how the scenario described at the start of Section 2 of the paper can be obtained by a change of parametrization of a more general scenario. Finally, we prove Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6.

The post-model-selection CI and its coverage probability

The usual $1-\alpha$ confidence interval for θ, based on the full model $\mathcal{M}_2$, is

$$I_2 = \left[\widehat{\theta} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2}\right],$$

where $[a \pm b]$ denotes the interval $[a-b, a+b]$ and the quantile z_a is defined by $P(Z \leq z_a) = a$ for $Z \sim N(0,1)$. Also, the usual $1-\alpha$ confidence interval for θ, assuming that the simpler model $\mathcal{M}_1$ is true, is

$$I_1 = \left[\widehat{\theta} - \rho\, {v_\theta}^{1/2}\widehat{\gamma} \pm z_{1-\alpha/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2}\left(1-\rho^2\right)^{1/2}\right].$$

The post-model-selection CI, with nominal coverage $1-\alpha$, is I_1 if $|\widehat{\gamma}| \leq d$; otherwise it is I_2.

A computationally convenient exact formula for the coverage probability of this CI is

$$(1-\alpha) + p(\gamma;\rho)\left(\Phi(-\gamma+d) - \Phi(-\gamma-d)\right) \\ - \int_{-d}^{d} \Phi\left(-z_{1-\alpha/2}, z_{1-\alpha/2}; \rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\right)\phi(h-\gamma)\, dh,$$

where

$$p(\gamma;\rho) = \Phi\left(\frac{\rho\,\gamma}{\left(1-\rho^2\right)^{1/2}} + z_{1-\alpha/2}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{\rho\,\gamma}{\left(1-\rho^2\right)^{1/2}} - z_{1-\alpha/2}\right).$$

For every given ρ, this coverage is an even function of γ and, for every given γ, this covereage is an even function of ρ. The proofs of these results are omitted, for the sake of brevity.

Change of parametrization of a more general scenario

Suppose that the full model $\mathcal{M}_2$ is given by

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}} = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\boldsymbol{\varphi} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{5}$$

where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}$ is a random n-vector of responses, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is a known $n \times p$ matrix with linearly independent columns ($p < n$), $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ is an unknown p-vector of parameters and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim N(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_n)$. Suppose that the parameter of interest is $\theta = \boldsymbol{a}^\top\boldsymbol{\varphi}$, where $\boldsymbol{a}$ is a specified non-zero p-vector. Also suppose that we define the parameter $\tau = \boldsymbol{c}^\top\boldsymbol{\theta} - t$, where $\boldsymbol{c}$ is a specified non-zero p-vector that is linearly independent of $\boldsymbol{a}$, and t is a specified number. The model $\mathcal{M}_1$ is $\mathcal{M}_2$ with $\tau = 0$.

We change to a more convenient parametrization as follows. Let $\boldsymbol{M}$ be the $p \times p$ matrix with first two rows $\boldsymbol{a}^\top\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)^{-1/2}$ and $\boldsymbol{c}^\top\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)^{-1/2}$, respectively. Denote the remaining $p-2$ rows of this matrix by $\boldsymbol{u}_1^\top, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_{p-2}^\top$, where the p-vectors $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_{p-2}$ are both orthonormal and orthogonal to the first two rows of $\boldsymbol{M}$. Let $\boldsymbol{e}_2$ denote the p-vector with second component equal to 1 and all other components equal to 0. Subtracting $t\,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{M}^{-1}\boldsymbol{e}_2$ from both sides of (5), we obtain $\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, where $\boldsymbol{X} = \widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{M}^{-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{M}\big(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}\big)^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\varphi} - t\,\boldsymbol{e}_2$. It may be shown that $\boldsymbol{\beta} = [\theta, \tau, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^\top]^\top$, where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \big(\boldsymbol{u}_1^\top(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\varphi}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{u}_{p-2}^\top(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}}^\top\widetilde{\boldsymbol{X}})^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\varphi}\big)$.

We now proceed to the proofs of Theorems 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. These proofs use the following easily-established lemma.

Lemma 1.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \widehat{\theta} \\ \widehat{\gamma} \end{bmatrix} \sim N\left(\begin{bmatrix} \theta \\ \gamma \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} v_\theta & \rho\, {v_\theta}^{1/2} \\ \rho\, {v_\theta}^{1/2} & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1

To make the dependence of $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}$ on $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\widehat{\gamma}$ explicit, we write $\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}} = h(\widehat{\theta}, \widehat{\gamma})$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(h(\widehat{\theta}, z)\,|\,\widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz\,, \quad \text{since } \widehat{\gamma} \sim N(\gamma, 1), \\ &= \int_{-d}^{d} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(h(\widehat{\theta}, z)\,|\,\widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz + \int_{-\infty}^{-d} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(h(\widehat{\theta}, z)\,|\,\widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz \\ &\qquad + \int_{d}^{\infty} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(h(\widehat{\theta}, z)\,|\,\widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\,dz. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by (2),

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}_{\text{PMS}}) &= \int_{-d}^{d} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(\widehat{\theta} - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2} z \,|\, \widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\, dz \\
&\qquad + \int_{-\infty}^{-d} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(\widehat{\theta} \,|\, \widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma) dz + \int_{d}^{\infty} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(\widehat{\theta} \,|\, \widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\, dz \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\big(\widehat{\theta} \,|\, \widehat{\gamma} = z\big)\phi(z-\gamma)\, dz - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2} \int_{-d}^{d} z\ \phi(z-\gamma)\, dz \\
&= E_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\widehat{\theta}) - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2} \int_{-d}^{d} z\ \phi(z-\gamma)\, dz \\
&= \theta - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2} k(\gamma),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$k(\gamma) = \int_{-d}^{d} z\ \phi(z-\gamma)\, dz.$$

We prove the properties of $k(\gamma)$ as follows. Since $z\,\phi(z)$ is an odd function, $k(0) = 0$. To show that $k(\gamma)$ is an odd function of γ, note that

$$k(-\gamma) = \int_{-d}^{d} z\ \phi(z+\gamma)\, dz = \int_{-d}^{d} z\ \phi(-z-\gamma)\, dz,$$

since ϕ is an even function. Changing the variable of integration to $y = -z$, we see that $k(-\gamma) = -k(\gamma)$. We prove that $k(\gamma) > 0$ for all $\gamma > 0$ as follows. Obviously,

$$k(\gamma) = \int_{0}^{d} z\,\phi(z-\gamma)\, dz + \int_{-d}^{0} z\,\phi(z-\gamma)\, dz.$$

Changing the variable of integration in the second integral to $y = -z$, we see that

$$k(\gamma) = \int_{0}^{d} z\,[\phi(z-\gamma) - \phi(z+\gamma)]\, dz$$

Suppose that $\gamma > 0$. We prove that $k(\gamma) > 0$ by proving that $\phi(z-\gamma) - \phi(z+\gamma) > 0$ for all $z > 0$. Since $\phi(z-\gamma) = \phi(z+\gamma)$ for $z = 0$, $\phi(z+\gamma)$ is a decreasing function of $z \in [0, \gamma]$ and $\phi(z-\gamma)$ is an increasing function of $z \in [0, \gamma]$, $\phi(z-\gamma) - \phi(z+\gamma) > 0$ for all $z \in (0, \gamma]$. All that remains to be proved is that $\phi(z-\gamma) - \phi(z+\gamma) > 0$ for all $z \in (\gamma, \infty)$, which is equivalent to $\phi(z-2\gamma) - \phi(z) > 0$ for all $z \in (2\gamma, \infty)$. Since $\phi(z)$ is a decreasing function of $z \in [0, \infty)$, $\phi(z-2\gamma) - \phi(z) > 0$ for all $z \in (2\gamma, \infty)$. Obviously, $k(\gamma)$ approaches 0 as $\gamma \to \infty$. Using the definition of Hermite polynomials, it may be shown that $k(\gamma) = \phi(d+\gamma) - \phi(d-\gamma) + \gamma\big[\Phi(d-\gamma) - \Phi(-d-\gamma)\big]$.

Proof of Theorem 2

It follows from (3) that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}(\widetilde{\theta}) &= \mathrm{var}(\widehat{\theta}) + \rho^2\, v_\theta\, \mathrm{var}(k(\widehat{\gamma})) - 2\,\rho\, v_\theta^{1/2}\, E\big((\widehat{\theta}-\theta)(k(\widehat{\gamma}) - E(k(\widehat{\gamma})))\big) \\ &= v_\theta + \rho^2\, v_\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \big(k(z) - m_k(\gamma)\big)^2\, \phi(z-\gamma)\, dz - 2\,\rho\, v_\theta\, E\big(G\, k(\widehat{\gamma})\big),\end{aligned}$$

where $G = (\widehat{\theta}-\theta)/v_\theta^{1/2}$. Now $E\big(G\, k(\widehat{\gamma})\,|\,\widehat{\gamma}=z\big) = k(z)\, E\,(G\,|\,\widehat{\gamma}=z) = \rho\, k(z)\,(z-\gamma)$, since

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} G \\ \widehat{\gamma} \end{array}\right] \sim N\left(\left[\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ \gamma \end{array}\right], \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{array}\right]\right), \tag{6}$$

by Lemma 1. Thus

$$E\,(G\, k(\widehat{\gamma})) = \rho \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k(z)(z-\gamma)\phi(z-\gamma)dz.$$

Proof of Theorem 3

To prove that q is an even function, we need to prove that

$$q(-\gamma) = \Phi(d+\gamma) - \Phi(-d+\gamma) - d\,\big[\phi(d-\gamma) + \phi(d+\gamma)\big]$$

is equal to

$$q(\gamma) = \Phi(d-\gamma) - \Phi(-d-\gamma) - d\,\big[\phi(d+\gamma) + \phi(d-\gamma)\big].$$

Since $\Phi(z) = 1 - \Phi(-z)$, $\Phi(d-\gamma) - \Phi(-d-\gamma) = \Phi(d+\gamma) - \Phi(-d+\gamma)$. Therefore q is an even function.

The formula for $\mathtt{sd}_{\mathrm{delta}}(\gamma)$ can, of course, be proved using Theorem 2 of Efron (2014). However, in the present scenario, a simpler proof results from the direct application of the delta-method approximation. By first order Taylor expansion, $k(\widehat{\gamma}) \approx k(\gamma) + k'(\gamma)\big(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\big)$. It follows from (3) that

$$\widetilde{\theta} \approx \widehat{\theta} - \rho\, v_\theta^{1/2}\,\big(k(\gamma) + k'(\gamma)\big(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma\big)\big).$$

The variance of the right-hand side is $v_\theta\big(1 - 2\rho^2 k'(\gamma) + \rho^2(k'(\gamma))^2\big)$. Using the definition of Hermite polynomials, it may be shown that $k'(\gamma) = q(\gamma)$.

Proof of Theorem 4

Part (a)

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\theta \in J\right) &= P\left(-z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathrm{sd}(\widehat{\gamma}) \le \widetilde{\theta} - \theta \le z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathrm{sd}(\widehat{\gamma})\right) \\
&= P\left(-z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathrm{sd}(\widehat{\gamma}) \le \widehat{\theta} - \theta - \rho {v_\theta}^{1/2} k(\widehat{\gamma}) \le z_{1-\alpha/2}\,\mathrm{sd}(\widehat{\gamma})\right),\ \text{by (3)}, \\
&= P\left(-z_{1-\alpha/2}\frac{\mathrm{sd}(\widehat{\gamma})}{{v_\theta}^{1/2}} \le G - \rho k(\widehat{\gamma}) \le z_{1-\alpha/2}\frac{\mathrm{sd}(\widehat{\gamma})}{{v_\theta}^{1/2}}\right),\ \text{where } G = (\widehat{\theta}-\theta)/{v_\theta}^{1/2}, \\
&= P\left(\ell(\widehat{\gamma},\rho) \le G \le u(\widehat{\gamma},\rho)\right) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P\left(\ell(h,\rho) \le G \le u(h,\rho)\,|\,\widehat{\gamma} = h\right)\phi(h-\gamma)\,dh.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from (6) that the distribution of G conditional on $\widehat{\gamma} = h$ is $N\left(\rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\right)$. Hence

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P\left(\ell(h,\rho) \le G \le u(h,\rho)|\widehat{\gamma} = h\right)\phi(h-\gamma)dh = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P\left(\ell(h,\rho) \le \widetilde{G} \le u(h,\rho)\right)\phi(h-\gamma)dh$$

where $\widetilde{G} \sim N\left(\rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\right)$. Therefore (4) holds.

Part (b): Our proof will use the following easily-established lemmas.

Lemma 2. $\Phi(\ell, u; \mu, v) = \Phi(-u, -\ell; -\mu, v)$.

Lemma 3. *(a)* $-u(-x,\rho) = \ell(x,\rho)$.
(b) $\ell(x,-\rho) = \ell(-x,\rho)$ *and* $u(x,-\rho) = u(-x,\rho)$.

Firstly, we prove that, for every given ρ, $CP(\gamma,\rho)$ is an even function of γ. By Lemma 2 and since ϕ is an even function,

$$\begin{aligned}
CP(-\gamma,\rho) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\big(-u(h,\rho), -\ell(h,\rho); \rho(-h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\big)\phi(-h-\gamma)\,dh \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\big(-u(-x,\rho), -\ell(-x,\rho); \rho(x-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\big)\phi(x-\gamma)\,dx \\
&\qquad \text{(by changing the variable of integration to } x = -h) \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\big(\ell(x,\rho), u(x,\rho); \rho(x-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\big)\phi(x-\gamma)\,dx\,,\ \text{by Lemma 3 (a)}, \\
&= CP(\gamma,\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

We now prove that, for every given γ, $CP(\gamma, \rho)$ is an even function of ρ. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
CP(\gamma, -\rho) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\left(\ell(h, -\rho), u(h, -\rho); -\rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\right)\, \phi(h-\gamma)\, dh \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\left(-u(h, -\rho), -\ell(h, -\rho); \rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\right)\, \phi(h-\gamma)\, dh\,, \text{ by Lemma 2,} \\
&= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \Phi\left(\ell(h, \rho), u(h, \rho); \rho(h-\gamma), 1-\rho^2\right)\, \phi(h-\gamma)\, dh\,, \text{ by Lemma 3,} \\
&= CP(\gamma, \rho)
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 6

Part (a): By Theorem 2, the length of the confidence interval J, with nominal coverage $1-\alpha$, is $2z_{1-\alpha/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2} r(\widehat{\gamma}; \rho)$. Thus the expected length of this CI is $2z_{1-\alpha/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2} E(r(\widehat{\gamma}, \rho))$. Also, the length of $I(c_{\min})$ is $2\, z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}\, v_\theta^{1/2}$. Thus

$$SEL(\gamma, \rho) = \frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}} E(r(\widehat{\gamma}, \rho)) = \frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} r(h; \rho)\, \phi(h-\gamma)\, dh.$$

Part (b): Our proof will use the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *For every given ρ, $r(\gamma; \rho)$ is an even function of γ and, for every given γ, $r(\gamma; \rho)$ is an even function of ρ.*

Since ϕ is an even function,

$$\begin{aligned}
SEL(-\gamma, \rho) &= \frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} r(h; \rho)\, \phi(-h-\gamma)\, dh \\
&= \frac{z_{1-\alpha/2}}{z_{(1+c_{\min})/2}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} r(-x; \rho)\, \phi(x-\gamma)\, dx \\
&\qquad \text{(by changing the variable of integration to } x = -h\text{)} \\
&= SEL(\gamma, \rho),
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 4. It also follows directly from this lemma that $SEL(\gamma, \rho)$ is an even function of ρ, for every given γ.

References

Breiman, L. (1996). Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning* 24, 123–140

Buckland, S.T., Burnham, K.P. and Augustin, N.H. (1997). Model selection: an integral part of inference. *Biometrics* 53, 603–618.

Efron, B. (2014). Estimation and accuracy after model selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 109, 991–1022.

Fletcher, D., Turek, D. (2011). Model-averaged profile likelihood intervals. *Journal of Agricultural, Biological and Environmental Statistics* 17, 38–51.

Hjort, N.L. and Claeskens, G. (2003). Frequentist model average estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 98, 879–899.

Kabaila, P. (2009). The coverage properties of confidence regions after model selection. *International Statistical Review* 77, 405–414.

Kabaila, P., Welsh, A.H. and Abeysekera, W. (2016). Model-averaged confidence intervals. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 43, 35–48.

Kabaila, P., Welsh, A.H. and Mainzer, R. (2016). The performance of model averaged tail area confidence intervals. To appear in *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, DOI 10.1080/03610926.2016.1242741

Leeb, H. and Pötscher, B.M. (2005). Model selection and inference: facts and fiction. *Econometric Theory* 21, 21–59.

Turek, D. and Fletcher, D. (2012). Model-averaged Wald confidence intervals. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 56, 2809–2815.